

REMARKS

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Claims 13-36 are pending in this application. In the December 11, 2006 office action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 13-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Weiss et al. (US 2002/0143872)

A. The Examiner's Rejection of claims 13-36 under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn in light of the applicants' amended claims.

As noted above, the examiner has rejected claims 13-36 in light of the Weiss reference. Independent claims 13 and 25 have now been amended to include the limitations of claims 17 and 29 wherein the status of service activity for one or more building sites is provided. In the examiner's office action, the examiner rejected claims 17 and 29 in light of FIGS 8 and 10. However, a review of FIGS. 8 and 10, and their description as shown in paragraphs 0054 and 0055 does not show this limitation. Specifically, FIG. 8 "illustrates multiple location details for a particular company" and FIG. 10 "illustrates an interface showing the details of a selected quote." Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 25 in light of the Weiss reference. Since the remaining claims depend upon either claim 13 or 25, the examiner is also respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of the dependent claims of the pending application as well.

It is further noted that the Weiss reference fails to disclose many of the dependent limitations of the pending application, the examiner's office action notwithstanding. For instance, with respect to claims 14 and 26, what is essentially claimed is the ability for a user to request further information about an individual service activity from a group of service activities. The examiner has indicated that this limitation is shown in Fig. 8. However, as noted by the specification in paragraph [0054], FIG. 8

“illustrates multiple location details for a particular company”, and not the ability to request further service information. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Weiss fails to disclose the subject matter set forth in claims 14 and 26.

With respect to claims 15 and 27, applicant has claimed that service activity information further comprises information relating to the type of service activity being provided. In rejection claims 15 and 27, the examiner has relied upon paragraph [0047], line 3. However, the first sentence of paragraph [0047] reads as follows: “The system also incorporates a Business Management System 12. The Business Management System 12 may be used for processing business data including Quote data 8A and Billing data 8B, which may be accessed or created by control module 2.” Accordingly, it is clear that Weiss fails to the concept of providing information relating to the type of service activity being provided.

With respect to claims 16 and 28, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of providing information about the type of system a service activity is being provided for is shown in paragraph [0046], line 7. It is believed that the examiner is referring to Work Order Data 8C in making this rejection. However, there is nothing in the Weiss reference that suggests that Work Order Data includes a type of system service is being provided for.

With respect to claims 17 and 29, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of providing information about the status of a service activity is shown in FIGS. 8 and 10. However, FIG. 8 merely relates to multiple location details for a particular company, and FIG. 10 illustrates an interface showing the details of a selected quote. Neither FIG. 8 or 10 suggest or disclose providing status information about a service activity.

With respect to claims 18 and 30, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of providing information about the call type of a service activity is shown in paragraph [0050], line 6 and FIG. 9. However, the relevant section of paragraph [0050] states “The control module 2 determines whether physical work must take place and, if so, it

creates Work Order data 8C in a database shared with the Work Management System 10.” It’s clear that the creating work order data is not the same as providing the call type of a service activity i.e. whether the work order relates to corrective maintenance or preventative maintenance. New dependent claims have further been added to claim these different types of maintenance information to be provided. A review of FIG. 9 reveals that this figure merely relates to an interface for selecting quotes, not providing call type information.

With respect to claims 19 and 31, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of providing service information about a plurality of sites in which service activity is being performed is shown in Fig. 4. In particular, the examiner has indicated that Fig. 4 “is evident of a network communicating about different site locations/buildings as described with the corresponding text to figure 4.” A review of the text associated with FIG. 4 fails to find this limitation. The concept of providing service information about a plurality of sites can be shown for example in Fig. 10 of the present invention, where for illustrative purposes only, service information relating to call status, call type and system information is provided for sites such as college park, east library and east point. This feature of the present invention is clearly not shown in the Weiss reference.

With respect to claims 20 and 32, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of providing further information about an individual building site relating to a service activity is shown in Fig. 6. However, a review of FIG. 6 shows is that what is displayed is not information about an individual building site, but information about a company. Typically companies are going to have more than one site, so this limitation is clearly not inherent in the Weiss reference.

With respect to claims 21 and 33, it is the examiner’s position that the concept of requesting information about an individual service order, retrieving the service order information, and transmitting the service order information that was requested is shown in FIGS 8 and 9 “wherein the user can request to the server information about a work order [and the] information is transmitted back to the user/client” However, the examiner

has mischaracterized FIGS 8 and 9. FIG. 8, as discussed above, illustrates multiple location details for a particular company and Fig. 9 illustrates an interface for selecting quotes.

With respect to claims 22 and 34, it is the examiner's position that transmitted service related information is organized by site is shown in FIG. 7 where "the client selects the company at which they desire to view." However, as discussed above, as companies may be comprised of more than one site, and Weiss does not teach, suggest or disclose a one to one correspondence between companies and individual sites.

With respect to claims 23 and 35, it is the examiner's position that Weiss teaches organizing service related information by system. In particular, it is the examiner's view that FIGS 8,9,10 and others "depict an organization structure of site, system and service. As shown in Fig. 18 of the present invention, especially at elements 418 -426, the present invention displays service information by system, whether it be fire, hvac, mechanical or security. As previously discussed, Fig. 8 merely discloses multiple location details for a particular company, Fig. 9 merely discloses an interface for selecting quotes and Fig. 10 merely discloses an interface showing the details of a selected quote.

With respect to claims 24 and 36, it is the examiner's position that Weiss discloses organizing service related information by type of service. The examiner's exact rejection is verbatim the same as the rejection of claims 23 and 36. As discussed with respect to claims 23 and 36, Fig. 8 merely discloses multiple location details for a particular company, Fig. 9 merely discloses an interface for selecting quotes and Fig. 10 merely discloses an interface showing the details of a selected quote.

In conclusion, with respect to each of the dependent claims discussed above, it is applicant's position that the Weiss reference does not teach or suggest any of the dependent claims discussed above, and that the examiner's rejection of each of the dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Wallace
Registration No. 44,486
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 2/21/07

Customer No. 28524
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Tel. No. (732) 321-3008